



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/811,246

03/29/2004

Takashi Hirakawa

SON-1659/CON

9013

23353 7590 08/23/2010
RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
LION BUILDING
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

LEIBY, CHRISTOPHER E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2629

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/23/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte TAKASHI HIRAKAWA and HIROYUKI YOSHINE

Appeal 2009-012063
Application 10/811,246
Technology Center 2600

Before MAHSHID D. SAADAT, THOMAS S. HAHN,
and ELENi MANTIS-MERCADER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SAADAT, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL¹

¹ The two-month time period for filing an appeal or commencing a civil action, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 1.304, or for filing a request for rehearing, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 41.52, begins to run from the “MAIL DATE” (paper delivery mode) or the “NOTIFICATION DATE” (electronic delivery mode) shown on the PTOL-90A cover letter attached to this decision.

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from a Final Rejection of claims 11-16, which constitute all the claims pending in the application as claims 1-10 have been canceled. An oral hearing was conducted on this appeal on July 20, 2010. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We reverse.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellants' invention relates to removing chrominance non-uniformity in liquid-crystal displays by supplying a primary color video signal and a common voltage to a liquid-crystal display panel and superimposing a correction signal for canceling chrominance non-uniformity on the primary color video signal or the common voltage (Spec. 3). Claim 11, which is illustrative of the invention, reads as follows:

11. A liquid-crystal display apparatus comprising:
 - a common voltage adjustment circuit adapted to adjust a common voltage;
 - a chrominance non-uniformity correction circuit adapted to generate a chrominance non-uniformity correction signal, said chrominance non-uniformity correction signal being superimposable onto said common voltage or said primary color video signal;
 - a display panel adapted to receive said common voltage and a primary color video signal, a difference between said common voltage and said primary color video signal being applied to said display panel.

The Examiner relies on the following prior art in rejecting the claims:

Matsuo	US 4,319,237	Mar. 9, 1982
Muraji	US 5,260,797	Nov. 9, 1993
Song	US 5,831,709	Nov. 3, 1998

Claims 11-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muraji and Matsuo.

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muraji, Matsuo, and Song.

Rather than repeat the arguments here, we make reference to the Briefs (Appeal Brief filed September 12, 2008; Reply Brief filed November 21, 2008) and the Answer (mailed November 12, 2008) for the respective positions of Appellants and the Examiner.

ISSUE

The Examiner reads the claimed common voltage circuit on common voltage generators 32 or 93/97/101 of Figures 3 and 8 of Muraji and finds that a difference between the common electrode 43 and the drain 41 in Figure 3 of Muraji meets the claimed difference between the common voltage and the primary color signal (Ans. 4). Appellants contend that Muraji applies a specified voltage supplied by a common voltage generating circuit 32 or 93/97/101 to the common electrode 43 or the common electrode of the image display devices 59/60/61, but fails to disclose applying a difference between the specified voltage and a primary color video signal to the common electrode (App. Br. 5-6; Reply Br. 2-4). Additionally, Appellants assert that the description of Figures 8-11 of Matsuo does not disclose or suggest applying a difference between said common voltage and said primary color video signal being applied to said display panel, as recited in claim 11 (App. Br. 6-8; Reply Br. 4-5).

Therefore, the issue is whether the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 11 by relying on Muraji and Matsuo for teaching or suggesting applying a

difference between said common voltage and said primary color video signal being applied to said display panel.

ANALYSIS

We agree with Appellants that the portions of Muraji relied on by the Examiner do not teach or suggest applying a difference between the common voltage and the primary color video signal to the display panel. We find that Muraji supplies a specified voltage by a common voltage generating circuit 32 to the common electrode 43 of the image display device 3 of Figure 3 (col. 5, ll. 29-32). Similarly, as shown in Figure 8 of Muraji, a specified voltage is supplied to the common electrode of the image display devices 59, 60, and 61 by common voltage generator circuits 93, 97, and 101 (col. 7, ll. 44-47). Therefore, while Muraji discloses common voltage generator circuits that supply a common voltage to the display device, the Examiner has not identified any disclosure in Muraji or Matsuo related to applying *a difference* between the common voltage and the primary color video signal to the display devices.

Additionally, we disagree with the Examiner (Ans. 7) that the video signal in Muraji is a difference between the video signal and the common electrode/voltage. As stated by Appellants (Reply Br. 4), the Examiner has not identified specific teachings, nor do we find any, in Muraji, to show how the difference between the specified voltage applied to the common electrode and any video signal voltage of Muraji would be just the video signal voltage. Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's interpretation of the reference teachings, Muraji only applies a common voltage and the corrected video signal to the display panel.

CONCLUSION

On the record before us and in view of the analysis above, we find that the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 11 by relying on Muraji and Matsuo for teaching or suggesting applying a difference between said common voltage and said primary color video signal being applied to said display panel. Therefore, we do not sustain the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claims 11-15, nor of claim 16 since the Examiner has not identified any teachings in Song that would have overcome the deficiency discussed above.

ORDER

The decision of the Examiner rejecting claims 11-16 is reversed.

REVERSED

babc

RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
LION BUILDING
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501
WASHINGTON, DC 20036